Facsimile: (909) 387-4069 E-Mail: laura.crane@cc.sbcounty.gov  Attorneys for Defendants, County of San Bernardino and San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department
9
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12
13 MICHELLE CHRISTINA RIVERA, Case No. 5:16-cv-00795 PSG-KSx Hon. Judge Phillip S. Gutierrez
14   Plaintiff,
DEFENDANTS COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO AND SAN BERNARDINO
v. COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT'S ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED
17 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
18 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO; SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY Complaint Filed: April 26, 2016
19 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT;
20 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO; SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHERIFF'S
21 DEPARTMENT; SHERIFF WILLIAM
GORE; SAN DIEGO DEPUTY SHERIFF FRANK LEYVA (#3348);
and DOES 1 through 10, in both their
individual and official capacities, 24
Defendants.
26 Defendants.
27
28

SAN BERNARDINO DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendants County of San Bernardino, and San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department ("Defendants") answer Plaintiff Michelle Christina Rivera's First Amended Complaint for Damages, as follows:

1. Answering paragraph 1, Defendants admit the within action is brought under 42 United States Code Section 1983 and California law. Defendants interpret the remaining allegations of this paragraph as legal conclusions not requiring a response. To the extent the remaining allegations are construed as factual allegations, Defendants

deny those allegations.

- 2. Answering paragraph 2, Defendants deny the factual allegations of this paragraph.
- 3. Answering paragraph 3, Defendants admit the factual allegations of this paragraph based on information and belief.
- 4. Answering paragraph 4, Defendants admit the County of San Bernardino is a local governmental entity organized and existing under the laws of the State of California. Defendants deny all remaining factual allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 5. Answering paragraph 5, Defendants admit the County of San Diego is a local governmental entity organized and existing under the laws of the State of California. Defendants deny all remaining factual allegations contained in this paragraph.
- 6. Answering paragraph 6, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- 7. Answering paragraph 7, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- 8. Answering paragraph 8, Defendants interpret the allegations of this paragraph as legal conclusions not requiring a response. To the extent the allegations are construed as factual allegations, Defendants deny those allegations.

13

17

18

20

22

24

26

- 5
- 7 8
- 10
- 12
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 19
- 21
- 23
- 25
- 27
- 28

- 9. Answering paragraph 9, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- 10. Answering paragraph 10, Defendants deny employees from the County of Bernardino caused Plaintiff's alleged injuries. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations on that basis.
- Answering paragraph 11, Defendants admit that on April 27, 2015 Plaintiff was involved in a vehicle pursuit that terminated in San Diego County after having been involved in Riverside and San Bernardino counties. Defendants deny arresting Plaintiff on April 27, 2015. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations on that basis.
- Answering paragraph 12, Defendants deny deputies from the San 12. Bernardino County Sheriff's Department were present when Plaintiff was arrested and/or injured, if Plaintiff was injured. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations on that basis.
- 13. Answering paragraph 13, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- Answering paragraph 14, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief 14. concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- Answering paragraph 15, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief 15. concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- 16. Answering paragraph 16, Defendants incorporate by this reference their responses to paragraphs 1 through 15.
- Answering paragraph 17, Defendants deny arresting Plaintiff or accusing 17. Plaintiff of threatening violence against on or more deputies from any department. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations on that basis.

13

14

12

15

16

17

18 19

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

20

28

- Answering paragraph 18, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief 18. concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- 19. Answering paragraph 19, Defendants deny Plaintiff was injured, if Plaintiff was injured, as the result of a County of San Bernardino policy, practice or custom. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations on that basis.
- Answering paragraph 20, Defendants incorporate by this reference their 20. responses to paragraphs 1 through 19.
- 21. Answering paragraph 21, Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the allegations of this paragraph and deny the allegations on that basis.
- 22. Answering paragraph 22, Defendants deny Plaintiff was injured, if Plaintiff was injured, as the result of a County of San Bernardino policy, practice or custom. Defendants lack sufficient information or belief concerning the remaining allegations of this paragraph and deny those allegations on that basis.

The remaining allegations of the First Amended Complaint are not alleged against these answering defendants.

# **DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES** FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff's injuries or damages, if any, were proximately caused by Plaintiff's negligence, in that Plaintiff failed to exercise ordinary care under the circumstances. Plaintiff is therefore barred from recovery herein.

## SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants request that in the event of a judgment in favor of Plaintiff, at a posttrial hearing, the judgment be reduced against these answering public entity Defendants for collateral source payments paid or obligated to be paid for services or benefits that were provided to or on behalf of Plaintiff prior to commencement of trial, as provided in Government Code section 985.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times mentioned in the First Amended Complaint, the individually involved law enforcement officers acted in good faith, with a reasonable belief that their actions were constitutional, and did not directly or indirectly perform any acts that would constitute a violation of Plaintiff's federal rights. Plaintiff is therefore precluded from maintaining her causes of action for violation of her civil rights, under principles of qualified immunity. [Harlow v. Fitzgerald (1981) 457 US 800.]

## FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times mentioned in the First Amended Complaint, Defendants acted in good faith, with reasonable suspicion and/or probable cause, and entertained an honest reasonable belief that their actions were reasonable and necessary thereby precluding Plaintiff from maintaining any causes of action for violation of her civil rights. [*Pierson v. Ray* (1967) 386 U.S. 547.]

#### FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiff failed to mitigate her damages, if any, and is therefore barred from recovery herein, or in the alternative, should have the damages reduced by that amount attributable to the failure to mitigate.

# SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At no time relevant to this litigation did Plaintiff sustain any violation of her civil rights pursuant to a governmental habit or custom, thereby precluding Plaintiff from maintaining her cause of action for violation of her civil rights. [Monell v. Dept. of Social Services (1978) 436 U.S. 658.]

## **SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

At all times relevant to this litigation, Defendants were performing discretionary functions and Defendants' conduct did not violate any established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would consider to be civil rights.

# <u>EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>

The First Amended Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of

action for punitive/exemplary damages against the Defendants.

#### NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At no time relevant to this litigation did Defendants violate any statute or enactment designed or intended to protect Plaintiff against the harm for which the Plaintiff seeks damages nor was any statute or enactment specified by Plaintiff in her Complaint designed to create a civil cause of action for a person in Plaintiff's position.

## TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The arrest, if any, was made by a peace officer when the person arrested had committed, or said officer had reason to believe that the person to be arrested had committed, a misdemeanor and/or felony.

#### ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times relevant to this litigation, Plaintiff voluntarily assumed all risks, responsibility and liability for the alleged injuries or damages, if any sustained by Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray that:

- Plaintiff take nothing by reason of her Complaint; 1.
- 2. For costs of suit herein incurred;
- 3. For defense costs, including reasonable attorney fees; and,
- For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper 4.

Dated: June 3, 2016 Respectfully submitted, JEAN-RENE BASLE County Counsel

By: /s/ Laura L. Crane

LAURA L. CRANE Deputy County Counsel

Attorneys for Defendants County of San Bernardino and San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

**DEMAND FOR JURY** Defendants hereby demand a jury trial as to all the issues framed by the pleadings pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 38(b), and Local Rule 38-1. Dated: June 3, 2016 Respectfully submitted, JEAN-RENE BASLE **County Counsel** By: /s/ Laura L. Crane LAURA L. CRANE **Deputy County Counsel** Attorneys for Defendants County of San Bernardino and San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department SAN BERNARDINO DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT